UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

JULIE ANNE CHINNOCK,

Case No. 1:18-cv-2935

Plaintiff.

VS.

ORDER

[Resolving Doc. 27]

NAVIENT CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

Plaintiff Julie Anne Chinnock again moves the Court to remand the case to state court and again argues that this Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction. For the reasons detailed in the Court's prior opinion, the Court **DENIES** Chinnock's motion to remand.²

The Court set an April 12, 2019 hearing to resolve whether it has personal jurisdiction over certain Defendants. Chinnock moves the Court to cancel that hearing, arguing that she would waive personal jurisdiction defenses by appearing. No. Further, as the Plaintiff, she has already consented to personal jurisdiction.³

Finally, contrary to Chinnock's claim, the parties have not stipulated to lack of personal jurisdiction. That is why the Court is holding the hearing. Thus, the Court **DENIES** Chinnock's motion to cancel the April 12, 2019 hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 5, 2019

James S. Gwin

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² Doc. 28 (opinion denying Plaintiff's motion to remand). Plaintiff offers nothing that would impact the Court's prior decision.

³ E.g., Adam v. Saenger, 303 U.S. 59, 67 (1938).